

**From:** [Jay Field](#)  
**To:** [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Cc:** [Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [rgensemer@parametrix.com](#); [Robert Neely](#); [Benjamin Shorr](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Bioassay Interpretation at Portland Harbor  
**Date:** 06/12/2009 04:16 PM  
**Attachments:** [PH\\_ToRef\\_090612.xls](#)

---

Eric,  
Attached is a spreadsheet that shows the data we have for the 293 tox samples and the calculated effect levels, which were based on the values for the 4 endpoints in table RE-2. As previously mentioned, we did not take into account statistical significance, since it was our understanding that statistical comparisons are not part of the reference envelope approach as described by MacDonald & Landrum.

Have we received any of the information that you requested from John Toll and LWG?

Have a good weekend,

Jay

Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

> All, I had another voicemail exchange with John, he would like to have  
> this discussion next Tuesday, June 16th. Does that work? I will  
> continue to work on getting some information ahead of time.

>  
> Eric

>  
>  
>  
>  
> Burt  
> Shephard/R10/USE  
> PA/US  
>  
> 06/08/2009 11:44  
> AM  
>  
> Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA To  
> Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, cc  
> jay.field@noaa.gov, Joe  
> Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,  
> rgensemer@parametrix.com  
>  
> Subject  
> Re: Bioassay Interpretation at  
> Portland Harbor(Document link:  
> Eric Blischke)

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

Eric  
Blischke/R10/USE  
PA/US  
06/08/2009 10:35  
AM  
Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, To  
rgensemer@parametrix.com, Joe  
Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, cc  
jay.field@noaa.gov  
Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA  
Subject

> Bioassay Interpretation at  
> Portland Harbor  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> At the AOPC meeting, it became apparent that our interpretation of the  
> sediment bioassay results did not match the LWG's interpretation. I am  
> interested in understanding the basis for this discrepancy. Based on my  
> review of the data, the bioassay results match up with the bins that we  
> established in Table RE-2 in our March 31, 2009 direction to LWG (see  
> previous email). Last week, I put in a call to John Toll to try to  
> understand the LWG's interpretation. Although I did not speak directly  
> with John, he left me a voice mail that described 3 possibilities for  
> the discrepancy:  
>  
> 1) The raw response rates differ slightly - e.g., 15% vs. 17%. John  
> does not know why this is the case.  
> 2) Significance Testing. The LWG used the biostats software. He  
> indicated that this is a complicated procedure but that the LWG followed  
> the decision tree associated with the software package and did not make  
> any choices that were inconsistent with the decision tree.  
> 3) The calculation of the level of the hit (e.g., low, moderate or  
> severe toxicity) based on a comparison to the reference envelope was  
> based on an added 10% to the reference envelop opposed to multiplying by  
> the reference envelope value by 1.1 or 1.2.  
>  
> I would like to set up a time to discuss this sometime this week.  
> Please let me know when you might be available. I will work with John  
> to hopefully have some information that we can use to focus the  
> discussion.  
>  
> Thanks, Eric,  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

--  
Jay Field  
Assessment and Restoration Division  
Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA  
7600 Sand Point Way NE  
Seattle, WA 98115-6349  
(P) 206-526-6404  
(F) 206-526-6865  
(E) jay.field@noaa.gov